

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.:

JESUS GONZALEZ

Plaintiff,

v.

GOLDEN DRAGON MIAMI LLC,  
d/b/a Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables, and  
CINCO M'S CORP.

Defendants.

---

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez, by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby sues Defendants, Golden Dragon Miami, LLC d/b/a Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables, and Cinco M's Corp, for injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§12181-12189 of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and 28 C.F.R. Part 36 and alleges:

1. This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") 42 U.S.C. §§12181-12189. This Court is vested with original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1331.

2. Venue is proper in the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) in that all events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred within the Southern District of Florida and the subject premises is located within the jurisdiction of this Court.

3. Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez ("Plaintiff") is an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA, and a resident of Miami-Dade County, Florida, and otherwise *sui juris*.

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

4. Defendants are authorized to conduct, and are conducting, business within the State of Florida and within the jurisdiction of this court.

**PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez (“Plaintiff”) is a resident of the state of Florida. Plaintiff has a “qualified disability” under the ADA as he is disabled with neuropathy and nerve damage due to radiation and utilizes a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff’s disability is defined in 42 U.S.C. §12102(1)(A)(2), 28 C.F.R. §36.105(b)(2) and 28 C.F.R. §36.105(2)(iii)(D).

6. Plaintiff is also an advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons, and a “tester” for the purpose of asserting his civil right, and to determine whether public accommodations are following the ADA/ADAAG.

7. Defendant, Golden Dragon Miami, LLC, is Florida limited liability company authorized to and doing business within the state of Florida, which upon information and belief is the owner and operator of the restaurant “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables” located within this district at, 2345 SW 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Miami, FL 33145, and the subject to this action, and referred hereto as “Golden Dragon Miami,” or “Operator”.

8. Defendant, Cinco M’s Corp, is Florida for-profit corporation authorized to and doing business within the state of Florida, which upon information and belief is the owner and operator of the commercial real property identified as Folio: 01-4116-009-2940, with post address of 2345 SW 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Miami, FL 33145, which houses the restaurant “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”, and referred hereto as “Cinco M’s Corp” or “Owner,”.

**FACTS**

9. Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, is the owner and operator of the restaurant “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”, located at 2345 SW 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Miami, FL 33145, and open to

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami**  
**Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

the general public. As such, it is a Place of Public Accommodation subject to the requirements of Title III of the ADA and its implementing regulation as defined by 42 U.S.C. §12181(7), §12182, and 28 C.F.R. §36.104.

10. At all times material hereto, Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp”, has leased its commercial property to Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, who in turn has operated (and continues to operate) its restaurant “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables” within that leased space.

11. As the owner/operator of a restaurant open to the public, Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, is defined as a “Public Accommodation” within meaning of Title III because it is a private entity which owns, or operates a restaurant; 42 U.S.C. §12182, §12181(7) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104.

12. On January 5, 2025, Plaintiff personally visited “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”, to inquire and/or use of their services, and to test for compliance with the ADA/ADAAG, but because he perambulates with the assistance of a wheelchair, Plaintiff was denied full and equal access, and enjoyment of the facilities, services, goods, and amenities, because of the architectural barriers met at the Subject Property

13. Based on the access impediments Plaintiff encountered, Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access by the operator Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, and by the owner of the commercial property, Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp”, which houses “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”.

14. As the owner and operator of a restaurant. Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, is aware of the ADA and the need to provide equal access to all areas of its facilities. Therefore, its failure to reasonably accommodate mobility impaired and disabled patrons by ensuring that its

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

facility is fully accessible is/was willful, malicious, and oppressive and in complete disregard for the civil rights of the Plaintiff and in violation of 28 C.F.R. §36.302.

15. As the owner of commercial property which built out and utilized as restaurant an establishment that provides goods/services to the general public, Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp”, is also defined as a “Public Accommodation” within meaning of Title III; 42 U.S.C. §12182, §12181(7) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104.

16. As the owners of commercial property, which is built as public accommodation, Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp” is aware of the ADA and the need to provide for equal access in all areas of its commercial property which are open to the public. Failure to reasonably accommodate mobility impaired and disabled patrons by ensuring that its property is fully accessible is/was willful, malicious, and oppressive and in complete disregard for the Civil Rights of the Plaintiff and in violation of 28 C.F.R. §36.302.

17. As a result of the joint and several discriminations by Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered loss of dignity, mental anguish and other tangible injuries and has suffered an injury-in-fact.

18. Plaintiff continues to desire to patronize and/or test “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”, operated by “Golden Dragon Miami” and located at the commercial property owned by “Cinco M’s Corp”, but continues to be injured, in that he continues to be discriminated against due to the barriers to access within that restaurant which are in violation of the ADA.

19. All requisite notice has been provided.

20. Plaintiff has been obligated to retain the civil rights law office of J. Courtney Cunningham, PLLC and has agreed to pay a reasonable fee for services in the prosecution of this

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami**  
**Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

cause, including costs and expenses incurred. Plaintiff is entitled to recover those attorney's fees, costs and expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12205.

**COUNT I – VIOLATIONS OF TITLE III OF THE ADA**

21. The ADA was enacted and effective as of July 26, 1990, and ADA legislation has been protecting disabled persons from discrimination due to disabilities since that time. Over 30 years have passed since enactment of the ADA, public accommodations and places of public accommodation have had adequate time for compliance.

22. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and,
- (iii) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced on a daily basis by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. §12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

23. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Plaintiff personally visited “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables” with the intention to use of their services, and/or test the public accommodation for compliance with the ADA/ADAAG; however, Plaintiff was denied adequate accommodation because, as a disabled individual who utilizes a wheelchair for mobility, Plaintiff met barriers to access. Therefore, Plaintiff has suffered an injury in fact.

24. Defendants, “Golden Dragon Miami” and “Cinco M’s Corp”, have discriminated (and continue to discriminate) against Plaintiff by denying full and equal access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations at the Subject Property in derogation of 42 U.S.C. §12101 *et seq.* and as prohibited by 42 U.S.C.

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

§12182 *et seq.*, by failing to remove barriers to access pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(a)(iv), where such removal is readily achievable.

25. Plaintiff has been unable to, and continues to be unable to, enjoy full and equal safe access to, and the benefits of, all the accommodations and services offered at “Keik Bakeshop Coral Gables”.

26. Defendants are jointly and singularly governed by the ADA and must comply therewith. However, Defendants have discriminated against disabled patrons in derogation of 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

27. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. §12134(a), on July 26, 1991 (as amended), the Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, promulgated Federal Regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA, known as the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (hereinafter “ADAAG”), 28 C.F.R. Part 36, under which said Department may obtain civil penalties of up to \$75,000 for the first violation and \$150,000 for any subsequent violation.

28. Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp”, owner of the commercial property, which houses Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami”, is in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12181 *et seq.*, the ADA and 28 C.F.R. §36.302 *et seq.*, and all Defendants, Defendant, “Golden Dragon Miami” (operator) and Defendant, “Cinco M’s Corp” (owner of the commercial property) (jointly and severally), are discriminating against the Plaintiff as a result of *inter alia*, the following specific violations:

**Parking Lot & Accessible Route**

- i. The parking facility does not provide compliant directional and informational signage to a compliant accessible parking space violating Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG and Section 216.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

- ii. Accessible parking spaces do not provide the required width. These are violations of the requirements in Sections FBC§11-4.6 and Florida Code§502.2, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The plaintiff had difficulty using the ramp, as the ramp is located on an excessive. Violation: Ramp does not provide the required slope as per Section 4.8.2 of the ADAAG and Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff had difficulty using the main door without assistance, as the main door has a non-compliant sloped surface within the required maneuvering clearance of the door. Violation: Maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door has non-compliant slope, violating Sections 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Sections 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**Access to Goods and Services**  
**Interior Seating**

- vi. The seating provided at the facility does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The facility does not provide the required amount of seating. Failing to provide sufficient amount of seating when dining surfaces are provided for the consumption of food or drinks for person(s) with a disability in violation of section 5.1 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 of the 2010 ADA Standards.

**Exterior Seating**

- viii. The seating provided at the facility does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ix. The facility does not provide the required amount of seating. Failing to provide sufficient amount of seating when dining surfaces are provided for the consumption of food or drinks for person(s) with a disability in violation of section 5.1 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 of the 2010 ADA Standards.

**Public Restroom – Vestibule Door**

- x. The plaintiff had difficulty opening the door without assistance, as it does not have the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door. Violation: Door does not

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami**  
**Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

provide the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door, for doors with closer and latch. Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- xi. The plaintiff could not enter the area without assistance, as the door has a non-compliant hardware. Violation: Non-compliant knob-type door hardware, requiring grasping and turning of the wrist to operate, violating Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**Men's Accessible Restroom – General Area**

- xii. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage location, Signage is mounted on the door leaf without violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xiii. The plaintiff could not enter the area without assistance, as the door has a non-compliant hardware. Violation: Non-compliant knob-type door hardware, requiring grasping and turning of the wrist to operate, violating Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xiv. The plaintiff had difficulty opening the door, as the stall partition is encroaching the maneuvering clearance on the door. Violation: Stall partition encroaches over the required maneuvering clearance on the pull side of the door. Sections 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, Sections 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards and section 28 CFR 36.211, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xv. The plaintiff had difficulty using the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirror provided in the restroom is in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xvi. The plaintiff could not use the paper towel dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The paper towel dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.2.5 of the ADAAG and Section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**Men's Accessible Restroom – Accessible Stall**

- xvii. The plaintiff had difficulty closing the stall door, as it is missing pull handles. Violation: Toilet compartment (stall) door does not provide pull handles on both sides of the door near the latch. Sections 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.



**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

- xviii. The plaintiff had difficulty closing the stall door as the toilet compartment (stall) door does not provide self-closing hinges. Sections 4.17.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xix. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the required clear floor space was not provided due to an encroaching item (Trash can). Violation: The trash bin is encroaching over the accessible water closet clear floor space. Section 4.16.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xx. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear wall grab bar does not have the required clearance. Violation: The water closet tank is mounted over the rear wall grab bar at the wrong height not providing the required clearance. Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xxi. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side wall grab bar does not have the required clearance. Violation: The toilet tissue dispenser is mounted under the side wall grab bar at the wrong height not providing the required clearance. Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xxii. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the rear wall. Violation: Water closet side wall grab bar is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the rear wall to the centerline of its outer flange. Sections 4.16.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xxiii. The plaintiff could not use the toilet tissue dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet tissue dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.16.6 and Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xxiv. The plaintiff could not use the paper towel dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The paper towel dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.2.5 of the ADAAG and Section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xxv. The plaintiff had difficulty using the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirror provided in the restroom is in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**WHEREFORE,** Plaintiff, Jesus Gonzalez hereby demands judgment against Defendants, Golden Dragon Miami, LLC, (lessee of the commercial property and operator of the Keik

**Gonzalez v. Golden Dragon Miami  
Complaint for Injunctive Relive**

Bakeshop Coral Gables located therein) and Cinco M's Corp, (owner of the commercial property) and requests the following injunctive and declaratory relief:

- a) The Court declare that Defendants have violated the ADA;
- b) The Court enter an Order directing Defendants to evaluate and neutralize their policies, practices and procedures toward persons with disabilities,
- c) The Court enter an Order requiring Defendants to alter the commercial property and the establishment located therein such that it becomes accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the full extent required by the Title III of the ADA;
- d) The Court award reasonable costs and attorney's fees; and
- e) The Court award any and all other relief that may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted this January 22, 2025.

By: /s/ J. Courtney Cunningham  
Juan Courtney Cunningham, Esq.  
FBN: 628166  
**J. COURTNEY CUNNINGHAM, PLLC.**  
8950 SW 74<sup>th</sup> Court, Suite 2201  
Miami, Florida 33156  
Telephone: 305-351-2014  
[cc@cunninghampllc.com](mailto:cc@cunninghampllc.com)  
[legal@cunninghampllc.com](mailto:legal@cunninghampllc.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiff*